arXiv:1403.0984v1 [math.AG] 5 Mar 2014

A marvellous embedding of the Lagrangian Grassmannian

Kevin Purbhoo*

March 6, 2014

Abstract

We give a embedding of the Lagrangian Grassmannian $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ inside an ordinary Grassmannian that is well-behaved with respect to the Wronski map. As a consequence, we obtain an analogue of the Mukhin-Tarasov-Varchenko theorem for $\mathrm{LG}(n)$. The restriction of the Wronski map to $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ has degree equal to the number of shifted or unshifted tableaux of staircase shape. For special fibres one can define bijections, which, in turn, gives a bijection between these two classes of tableaux. The properties of these bijections lead a geometric proof of a branching rule for the cohomological map $H^*(\mathrm{Gr}(n,2n)) \otimes H^*(\mathrm{LG}(n)) \to H^*(\mathrm{LG}(n))$, induced by the diagonal inclusion $\mathrm{LG}(n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{LG}(n) \times \mathrm{Gr}(n,2n)$. We also discuss applications to the orbit structure of jeu de taquin promotion on staircase tableaux.

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to relate the geometry of the Lagrangian Grassmannian $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ to the combinatorics of shifted and unshifted Young tableaux that describe its cohomology. We will do this by defining a very special embedding $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ inside an ordinary Grassmannian. The idea is that one can label certain points of a Grassmannian by tableaux, and this labelling encodes certain information about intersections of Schubert varieties. The main result of this paper describes how this tableau labelling restricts to $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ under our embedding. We will use this to give coherent geometric explanations for some lesser known (but beautiful and slightly mysterious) facts in Schubert calculus and tableau combinatorics.

Let $\mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ denote the set of standard Young tableaux whose shape is the $n \times (n+1)$ rectangle $\square$. As a matter of convenience, we will sometimes depict our tableaux with entries from an arbitrary totally ordered alphabet, rather than the usual positive integers. For example, Figure 1.1 shows two tableaux in $\mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ with entries from

*Research partially supported by an NSERC Discovery grant.

$1'$	1	2	$3'$	$5'$
$2'$	$4'$	4	$6'$	8
3	6	$7'$	7	9
5	$8'$	$9'$	$10'$	10

1	2	7	10	$10'$
3	6	8	$8'$	$7'$
4	9	$9'$	$6'$	$2'$
5	$5'$	$4'$	$3'$	$1'$

Figure 1.1: A diagonally symmetrical tableau (left), and an antidiagonally symmetrical tableau (right), with $n = 4$.

the alphabet $\mathscr{M} := \{1, 2, \ldots, M, 1', 2', \ldots, M'\}$, where $M := \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$. In the tableau on the left, the elements of $\mathscr{M}$ are ordered

$$1' < 1 < 2' < 2 < \cdots < M' < M\,. \tag{1.1}$$

This tableau has a symmetry: for $i \geq j$, if the entry in row i and column j is k or k', then the entry in row j and column $i+1$ is k' or k. We call this a **diagonal symmetry**, and we denote by $\mathsf{DST}(\square)$ the set of of all diagonally symmetrical tableaux of shape $\square$. The tableau on the right of Figure 1.1 also has entries from $\mathscr{M}$, but this time the elements of $\mathscr{M}$ are ordered

$$1 < 2 < \cdots < M < M' < \cdots < 2' < 1'\,. \tag{1.2}$$

This tableaux also has a symmetry: if the entry k is in row i and column j, then the entry k' is in row $n+1-j$ and column $n+2-i$. We call this an **antidiagonal symmetry**, and we denote by $\mathsf{AST}(\square)$ the set of all antidiagonally symmetrical tableaux of shape $\square$. These two classes of tableaux can be regarded as "doubled" versions of shifted and unshifted staircase tableaux, which are central to the theory of $H^*(\mathrm{LG}(n))$ and Schur P-, Q- and S-functions, (see [9, 14, 20, 25, 28]).

It is a curious fact that $|\mathsf{DST}(\square)| = |\mathsf{AST}(\square)|$. This can be proved in a variety of ways: using hook-length formulae [5, 26]; by interpreting both sides as a statement about the cohomology of the Lagrangian Grassmannian; or by an explicit bijection. The procedure used to define the bijection arises also in the context of domino tableaux and self-evacuating tableaux [11, 18]. We will refer to it as **folding** a tableau. Given $T \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ with entries from $\mathscr{M}$ ordered as in (1.2), define $\mathsf{fold}(T) \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ to be the result of the following operation: For each k from 1 to M, slide the box containing k' through the subtableau formed by entries $\{k, k+1, \ldots, M, M', \ldots, (k+1)'\}$. After the k^{th} step, the entries are ordered

$$1' < 1 < \cdots < k' < k < k+1 < \cdots < M < M' < \cdots < (k+1)'\,,$$

and in particular the entries of $\mathsf{fold}(T)$ are ordered as in (1.1). The procedure is illustrated in Figure 1.2. Since each step is reversible, it is clear that $\mathsf{fold} : \mathsf{SYT}(\square) \to \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ is a bijection. It is far less clear — but nevertheless true — that $T \in \mathsf{AST}(\square)$



Figure 1.2: Folding a tableau. At each step, the entry in the lower right corner slides through the shaded subtableau.

if and only if $\mathrm{fold}(T) \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$. This can be proved combinatorially, using properties of mixed insertion [7]. One of the goals of paper is to explain the relationship between this bijection and the cohomological argument. The main ingredient is a rather remarkable morphism of algebraic varieties, called the Wronski map.

Let $X := \mathrm{Gr}(n, \mathbb{C}_{2n}[z])$ be the Grassmannian of n-planes in the $2n+1$-dimensional vector space of polynomials of degree at most $2n$. The *Wronski map*

$$\mathrm{Wr} : X \to \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}_{2M}[z]\big) \tag{1.3}$$

assigns to each $x \in X$ a polynomial $\mathrm{Wr}(x; z)$ of degree at most $2M$, considered up to scalar multiple (see Section 2). This map has a number of pleasant properties. It is equivariant with respect to the group of Möbius transformations, which acts on both X and $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}_{2M}[z]\big)$. Eisenbud and Harris [3] proved that Wr is a flat, finite morphism of degree $|\mathsf{SYT}(\square)|$; hence for any polynomial $h(z) \in \mathbb{C}_{2M}[z]$, the fibre $\mathrm{Wr}^{-1}(h(z))$, has exactly $|\mathsf{SYT}(\square)|$ points, counting with multiplicity. Moreover, suppose the roots of $h(z)$ lie on a circle in $\mathbb{CP}^1$. (Here and throughout this paper, if $\deg(h(z)) < 2M$ we regard $h(z)$ as having a root of multiplicity $2M - \deg(h(z))$ at ∞.) In this case, it is a consequence of the Mukhin-Tarasov-Varchenko theorem [12, 13] that one can define a surjective correspondence $\mathsf{SYT}(\square) \to \mathrm{Wr}^{-1}(h(z))$, which we denote by $T \mapsto x_T$. When $h(z)$ has distinct roots, this is a bijection, and in general the correspondence encodes information about how certain Schubert varieties intersect [15]. As such, it can be used to produce geometric proofs of a variety of non-trivial facts involving tableaux.

The correspondence can also be used to study subvarieties of the Grassmannian that are well-behaved with respect to the Wronski map. For example, there is an "obvious" embedding of the orthogonal Grassmannian $\mathrm{OG}(n, 2n+1)$ in X. It is defined using a symmetric bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathbb{C}_{2n}[z]$ with the following properties: (i) the form is invariant under Möbius transformations; and (ii) the standard flag is an orthogonal flag. These two conditions on $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ are enough to ensure that the embedded orthogonal Grassmannian interacts very nicely with the Wronski map. In [16, 17] we proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Y denote the image of $\mathrm{OG}(n,2n+1)$ embedded in X.*

(i) If $x \in Y$ then $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ is a square.

(ii) Let $\mathsf{DST}'(\square) \subset \mathsf{DST}(\square)$ denote the set of diagonally symmetrical tableaux with the property that k' is left of k, for all $k = 1,\ldots,M$. Suppose $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ is a square with roots that lie on a circle in $\mathbb{CP}^1$. Then $x \in Y$ if and only if $x = x_T$ for some tableau $T \in \mathsf{DST}'(\square)$.

Theorem 1.1 has a number of consequences, which are discussed in [16, 17] and also briefly in [18, Remark 1.12]. The main example is a geometric proof of the of the Littlewood-Richardson rule for $H^*(\mathrm{OG}(n,2n+1))$, using properties of the correspondence $x \mapsto x_T$.

In this paper we exhibit an embedding of the Lagrangian Grassmannian that interacts nicely with the Wronski map, and explore the consequences. However, unlike the situation with $\mathrm{OG}(n,2n+1)$, the embedding of $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ is far from obvious. The author is not aware of any simple properties that would lead one to consider it, or any clear geometric reason why such a nice embedding should exist. The clues for its existence come from the surprising combinatorial properties of $\mathsf{DST}(\square)$ and $\mathsf{AST}(\square)$. Our main result in this paper is essentially an analogue of Theorem 1.1 for the Lagrangian Grassmannian.

Theorem 1.2. *There is a subvariety $\Omega \subset X$, isomorphic to the Lagrangian Grassmannian $\mathrm{LG}(n)$, with the following properties.*

(i) If $x \in \Omega$ then $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ is an even polynomial (i.e. $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z) = \mathrm{Wr}(x;-z)$).

(ii) Suppose $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ is an even polynomial whose roots lie on a circle in $\mathbb{CP}^1$ that passes through 0 and ∞. Then $x \in \Omega$ if and only if $x = x_T$ for some $T \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$.

(iii) Suppose $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ is an even polynomial whose roots lie on a circle in $\mathbb{CP}^1$ that does not pass through 0 and ∞. Then $x \in \Omega$ if and only if $x = x_T$ for some $T \in \mathsf{AST}(\square)$.

If a polynomial is even and its roots lie on a circle, then this circle must be symmetrical under $z \mapsto -z$; hence it is is either a rotation of $\mathbb{RP}^1$ (which passes through 0 and ∞), or a dilatation the unit circle (which passes through neither). It is important to remark that parts (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 1.2 use different conventions: the definition of x_T depends on the circle under consideration, and the conventions are *not* consistent with each other in the case where the roots of $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ lie on the intersection of two different circles.

Putting Theorem 1.2(ii) and (iii) together gives one explaination for the identity $|\mathsf{DST}(\square)| = |\mathsf{AST}(\square)|$: both are equal to the degree of the Wronski map restricted to Ω. In Section 3 we will see how this can be viewed as a refinement of the cohomological argument, which is a statement about the map $H^*(X) \to H^*(\mathrm{LG}(n))$ induced by the inclusion $\mathrm{LG}(n) \hookrightarrow X$. Moreover, in Section 4 we will see how the bijection between $\mathsf{AST}(\square)$ and $\mathsf{DST}(\square)$ is a further refinement of these arguments: folding

arises as a geometric interpolation between cases (ii) and (iii). The properties of this interpolation, are laid out in Proposition 4.3. Using these, we also obtain a proof of the branching rule in Schubert calculus for the map $H^*(X) \otimes H^*(\mathrm{LG}(n)) \to H^*(\mathrm{LG}(n))$ (Theorem 4.5).

It is interesting to note that the consequences of Theorem 1.2 are not perfectly analogous to the consequences of Theorem 1.1. Instead of a Littlewood-Richardson rule, we obtain a branching rule. The embedding of $\mathrm{OG}(n, 2n+1)$ resolved a conjecture of Sottile [16], whereas the embedding in this paper leads to an analogue (Theorem 3.9) that is not equivalent to the corresponding conjecture for $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ [22]. The differences can be attributed to the fact that the condition "$\mathrm{Wr}(x; z)$ is a square" is preserved by all Möbius transformations, whereas the condition "$\mathrm{Wr}(x; z)$ is even" is only preserved by the subgroup $\mathrm{O}_2(\mathbb{C})$. The smaller symmetry group, on the one hand, means that some of the old arguments no longer work; on the other hand, the fact that the points $0, \infty$ in $\mathbb{CP}^1$ are special opens up other possibilities. Theorem 4.5 is what emerges naturally from this situation.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give an overview of the definitions and properties of the Wronski map and related results; we define the correspondence $T \mapsto x_T$, with an focus on the different conventions that are used in parts (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 1.2. Section 3 is all about the Lagrangian Grassmannian: we construct the embedding Ω and prove several facts about it, including Theorem 1.2. In Section 4, we discuss our main applications of Theorem 1.2: the bijection between $\mathsf{AST}(\square)$ and $\mathsf{DST}(\square)$, and the branching rule in Schubert calculus. We conclude, in Section 5, with a miscellany of unresolved questions and other points of interest, such as the defining equations of Ω as a projective scheme, and the orbit structure of promotion on staircase tableaux.

2 Background

The existence of the correspondence $T \mapsto x_T$ can be attributed to the remarkable properties of the Wronski map. In this section, we recall the relevant definitions and theorems, including the construction of the correspondence. In addition, we will examine the significance of some different conventions that can be used in defining correspondence; in particular, we will see how the combinatorial operation of folding arises geometrically, through a change of conventions. We will assume familiarity with some of the definitions from tableau combinatorics that arise in the Schubert calculus of the Grassmannian, including the jeu de taquin [24], and the dual equivalence relation [8]. For the most part, this section follows the exposition in [17, 18], and we refer the reader to these papers for more detail. Further discussion of the Wronski map and its properties can be found in the survey article [23].

The **Wronski map** (1.3) is defined as follows. If $x \in X$ is the n-plane spanned by

polynomials $f_1(z),\dots,f_n(z)$, let

$$\mathrm{Wr}(x;z) := \begin{vmatrix} f_1(z) & \cdots & f_n(z) \\ f_1'(z) & \cdots & f_n'(z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ f_1^{(n-1)}(z) & \cdots & f_n^{(n-1)}(z) \end{vmatrix}.$$

It is not hard to see that this a non-zero polynomial of degree at most $2M$, which up to a scalar multiple depends only on x; hence $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ is well-defined as an element of $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}_{2M}[z]\big)$. If $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1,\dots,a_{2M}\}$ is a multiset of points in $\mathbb{CP}^1$, we let $X(\mathbf{a}) := \mathrm{Wr}^{-1}(h(z))$ denote the fibre of the Wronski map at the polynomial $h(z) = \prod_{a_k\neq\infty}(z + a_k)$.

The group $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ acts on each vector space $\mathbb{C}_m[z]$ by Möbius transformations: If $\phi = \left(\begin{smallmatrix}\phi_{11} & \phi_{12}\\ \phi_{21} & \phi_{22}\end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$, we let

$$\phi f(z) := (\phi_{21}z + \phi_{11})^m f\left(\frac{\phi_{22}z + \phi_{12}}{\phi_{21}z + \phi_{11}}\right)$$

for $f(z) \in \mathbb{C}_m[z]$. This induces an action of of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ on X, and on $\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{C}_{2M}[z]\big)$, and the Wronski map is $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$-equivariant. The action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ on $\mathbb{CP}^1$ is inverse to this: for $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$,

$$\phi(a) := \frac{\phi_{11}a + \phi_{12}}{\phi_{21}a + \phi_{22}}.$$

With these conventions, $\phi(X(\mathbf{a})) = X(\phi(\mathbf{a}))$.

For each $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, define a full flag in $\mathbb{C}_{2n}[z]$,

$$F_\bullet(a) \ : \ \{0\} \subset F_1(a) \subset \cdots \subset F_{2n}(a) \subset \mathbb{C}_{2n}[z].$$

For $a \in \mathbb{C}$, $F_i(a) := (z+a)^{2n+1-i}\mathbb{C}[z] \cap \mathbb{C}_{2n}[z]$ is the set of polynomials in $\mathbb{C}_{2n}[z]$ divisible by $(z+a)^{2n+1-i}$. We also set $F_i(\infty) := \mathbb{C}_{i-1}[z] = \lim_{a\to\infty} F_i(a)$. We note that $\phi(F_\bullet(a)) = F_\bullet(\phi(a))$ for $\phi \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$.

Let Λ denote the set of all partitions $\lambda : \lambda^1 \geq \lambda^2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda^n \geq 0$, with at most n parts and $\lambda^1 \leq n+1$. We will represent certain partitions pictorially: for example, $\square$ denotes the largest partition in Λ; $\square$ is the partition with a single box; and $\blacktriangledown$ is the partition $n \geq n-1 \geq \cdots \geq 2 \geq 1$. Write $\mu \subseteq \lambda$ if $\mu^i \leq \lambda^i$ for all i. The complementary partition to λ inside $\square$ is denoted $\lambda^\vee : n+1-\lambda^n \geq \cdots \geq n+1-\lambda^1$. The set of standard Young tableaux of shape λ is denoted $\mathsf{SYT}(\lambda)$.

For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let $J(\lambda) := \{i - 1 + \lambda^{n+1-i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. The **Schubert cell** associated to λ relative to the flag $F_\bullet(a)$ is

$$X_\lambda^\circ(a) := \big\{x \in X \;\big|\; \dim(x \cap F_{2n+1-i}(a)) - \dim(x \cap F_{2n-i}(a)) = \delta_{i\in J(\lambda)}, \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq 2n\big\}.$$

where $\delta_{i\in J(\lambda)} = 1$ if $i \in J(\lambda)$ and 0 otherwise. Its closure is the **Schubert variety**

$$X_\lambda(a) := \big\{x \in X \;\big|\; \dim(x \cap F_{i+1}(a)) \geq \lambda_{n+1-\lambda^i+i}, \text{ for } i = 1,\dots,n\big\}.$$

These conventions are such that $|\lambda|$ is the codimension of $X_\lambda(a)$ in X. The **Schubert class** $[X_\lambda] \in H^*(X)$ is the cohomology class defined by $X_\lambda(a)$ for any $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$. The following lemma relates the Schubert varieties to the Wronski map.

Lemma 2.1. *For $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, $(z+a)^k$ divides $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ if and only if $x \in X_\lambda(a)$ for some partition $\lambda \vdash k$. If $(z+a)^k$ is the largest power of $(z+a)$ that divides $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$, then $x \in X^\circ_\lambda(a)$. (Note: The condition $(z+\infty)^k$ divides $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$ is interpreted to mean $\deg(\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)) \le 2M-k$.)*

The key fact that allows to define a correspondence between tableaux and fibres of the Wronski map is the transversality theorem of Mukhin, Tarasov and Varchenko.

Theorem 2.2 (Mukhin-Tarasov-Varchenko [13])**.** *Let $a_1,\dots,a_K \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ be distinct points that lie on a circle. Let $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_K \in \Lambda$ be partitions such that $|\lambda_1|+\cdots+|\lambda_K| = 2M$. Then the intersection of Schubert varieties*

$$X_{\lambda_1}(a_1) \cap \cdots \cap X_{\lambda_K}(a_K) \tag{2.1}$$

is finite and transverse, and hence contains exactly $\int_X [X_{\lambda_1}]\cdots[X_{\lambda_K}]$ many points.

In particular if $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1,\dots,a_{2M}\}$ is a set of (distinct) points that lie on a circle then by Lemma 2.1, $X(\mathbf{a}) = X_{\square}(a_1) \cap \cdots \cap X_{\square}(a_{2M})$. By Theorem 2.2 this is a transverse intersection, i.e. the fibre $X(\mathbf{a})$ is reduced, and the number of points in the fibre is $\int_X [X_{\square}]^{2M} = |\mathsf{SYT}(\square)|$.

We now use this fact to define an actual map from $\mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ to the fibre $X(\mathbf{a})$, when the points of $\mathbf{a}$ lie on a circle. To begin, suppose the circle in question is $\mathbb{RP}^1$, and $\mathbf{a}$ is a set. Consider the total order $\preceq$ on $\mathbb{RP}^1$, defined by $a \preceq b$, if either $a = b$, $|a| < |b|$, or $0 < a = -b$. We may assume, without loss of generality, that $a_1 \prec a_2 \prec \cdots \prec a_{2M}$. The definition that follows is not the simplest, but it is the one that we will need in Section 4. Equivalent, alternative definitions are given in [15, 18].

Definition 2.3. Let $x \in X(\mathbf{a})$, with $\mathbf{a}$ as above. First, we define a sequence of partitions $\lambda_k \in \Lambda$, $k = 0,\dots,2M$. For $t \in [0,1]$, let

$$\mathbf{a}_{k,t} := \begin{cases} \{ta_1, ta_2, \dots, ta_k, a_{k+1}, a_{k+2}, \dots, a_{2M}\} & \text{if } k \le M \\ \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, t^{-1}a_{k+1}, t^{-1}a_{k+2}, \dots, t^{-1}a_{2M}\} & \text{if } k \ge M+1. \end{cases}$$

If $t \in (0,1]$, the fibre $X(\mathbf{a}_{k,t})$ is reduced. Therefore, there is unique (continuous) lifting of the path $\mathbf{a}_{k,t}$, $t \in [0,1]$ to a path $x_{k,t} \in X(\mathbf{a}_{k,t})$, with $x_{k,1} = x$. Now, consider the point $x_{k,0}$. If $k \le M$, then 0 appears k times in the multiset $\mathbf{a}_{k,0}$, i.e. z^k divides $\mathrm{Wr}(x_{k,0};z)$; by Lemma 2.1, $x_{k,0} \in X^\circ_{\lambda_k}(0)$ for some partition $\lambda_k \vdash k$. Similarly, if $k \ge M+1$, then ∞ appears $2M-k$ times in the multiset $\mathbf{a}_{k,0}$, which implies that $x_{k,0} \in X^\circ_{\lambda_k^\vee}(\infty)$ for some partition $\lambda_k \vdash k$.

The correspondence is obtained by encoding this sequence of partitions into a tableau. For $T \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ let $T_{[i,j]}$ denote the subtableau of T formed by entries

$\{i, i+1, \ldots, j\}$. We say x **corresponds** to T and write $x_T := x$ if $T_{[1,k]}$ has shape λ_k for all k. When there is a need to emphasize the fibre $X(\mathbf{a})$, we will use the notation $x_T(\mathbf{a}) := x$.

It is not immediately apparent that Definition 2.3 defines a function, let alone a bijection between $\mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ and $X(\mathbf{a})$. The fact that both are true was proved by Eremenko and Gabrielov [2].

The definition of $x_T(\mathbf{a})$ can be extended to the case where $\mathbf{a}$ is a multiset of points on $\mathbb{RP}^1$. In this paper, we will employ two different conventions for doing this. The first is the convention used in [17, 18], and it is the one we use in part (iii) of Theorem 1.2.

Convention 2.4. Let $\mathscr{A}$ be the set of all multisets $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{2M}\}$, with $a_1, \ldots, a_{2M} \in \mathbb{RP}^1$. Define a $\preceq$**-zone** of $\mathscr{A}$, to be a subset of the form

$$\left\{ \{a_1 \preceq a_2 \preceq \cdots \preceq a_{2M}\} \in \mathscr{A} \;\middle|\; 0 \le \epsilon_k a_k \le \infty \text{ for } k = 1, \ldots, 2M) \right\},$$

where $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_{2M} \in \{\pm 1\}$. Each $\preceq$-zone is simply connected. We define $x_T(\mathbf{a})$ by extending the correspondence continuously on any $\preceq$-zone.

When $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{A}$ is in more than one $\preceq$-zone, the extensions are compatible, so Convention 2.4 defines $x_T(\mathbf{a})$ uniquely. Since the correspondence is bijective when $\mathbf{a}$ is a set, it is surjective for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{A}$. In addition, using Convention 2.4, the correspondence has the following properties:

Theorem 2.5 (See [17, Theorem 4])**.** *Let $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{2M}\} \in \mathscr{A}$, with $a_1 \preceq a_2 \preceq \cdots \preceq a_{2M}$. Suppose that $a_i = a_{i+1} = \cdots = a_j$, and $a_k \neq a_i$ for $k < i$ or $k > j$.*

(i) For $T \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$, $x_T(\mathbf{a}) \in X^\circ_\lambda(a_i)$ where λ is the rectification shape of $T_{[i,j]}$.

(ii) Let $T, T' \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ be two tableaux such that $T_{[1,i-1]} = T'_{[1,i-1]}$, $T_{[j+1,2M]} = T'_{[j+1,2M]}$. Then $x_T(\mathbf{a}) = x_{T'}(\mathbf{a})$ if and only if $T_{[i,j]}$ is dual equivalent to $T'_{[i,j]}$.

The second convention for extending the definition of $x_T(\mathbf{a})$ is the one used part (ii) of Theorem 1.2, and it is only applicable in the case where $\mathbf{a}$ is a multiset of points invariant under the transformation $z \mapsto -z$, i.e. when $\mathbf{a} = -\mathbf{a}$.

Convention 2.6. Let $\overline{\mathscr{A}} := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{A} \mid \mathbf{a} = -\mathbf{a}\}$. Since each component of $\overline{\mathscr{A}}$ is simply connected, we define $x_T(\mathbf{a})$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in \overline{\mathscr{A}}$ by extending the correspondence continuously to all of $\overline{\mathscr{A}}$.

Again, with this convention, the correspondence is surjective for all $\mathbf{a} \in \overline{\mathscr{A}}$, but it does not enjoy the more exciting properties stated in Theorem 2.5. Nevertheless, we will use Convention 2.6 whenever possible. For most of our purposes, the gain of continuity outweighs the loss of Theorem 2.5, and when we need the latter, it is possible to switch from one convention to the other. Given $T \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ with entries as in (1.1), and $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, -a_1, \ldots, a_M, -a_M\} \in \overline{\mathscr{A}}$ with $0 \le a_1 \le a_2 \le \cdots \le a_M \le \infty$, we

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1' & 2' & 2 & 4' \\ \hline 1 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 3' & 5' & 6' & 6 \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad T^\circ = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 & 4 & 4' \\ \hline 1' & 3 & 2' & 5 \\ \hline 3' & 6 & 5' & 6' \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Figure 2.1: An example of T and T°, where $\mathbf{a} = \{0, 0, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, \infty, \infty, \infty, \infty\}$. The entries of T° are ordered $1 < 1' < 2 < 3 < 4 < 2' < 3' < 4' < 5 < 6 < 5' < 6'$.

produce a related tableau T° by the following procedure. For each k from M to 1, find the largest ℓ such that $a_k = a_\ell$, and slide entry k' through the subtableau formed by entries $\{k, k+1, \ldots, \ell\}$. As we slide, the entries are reordered accordingly (i.e. so that $\ell < k' < \min\{(k+1)', \ell+1\}$). See Figure 2.1 for an example.

Proposition 2.7 (See [18, Section 3]). *If $x = x_T$ according to Convention 2.6, then $x = x_{T^\circ}$ according to Convention 2.4.*

In general, if $\mathbf{a}$ is a multiset of points that lie on an arbitrary circle Γ, we can define the correspondence $\mathsf{SYT}(\square) \to X(\mathbf{a})$ as follows. Choose a Möbius transformation $\psi_\Gamma \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\psi_\Gamma(\Gamma) = \mathbb{RP}^1$. Then define $x_T(\mathbf{a}) := \psi_\Gamma^{-1}(x_T(\psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a}))$. This definition is of course dependent on the choice of Möbius transformation ψ_Γ, and so we will sometimes use the notation $x_T(\mathbf{a}, \psi_\Gamma)$, when it is important to emphasize the transformation that is being used. However, for the circles that appear in Theorem 1.2, we will establish some standards.

Let $S^1 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z^2| = 1\}$ denote the unit circle, and write $\sqrt{-1}$ for the imaginary unit. For $\mathbb{RP}^1$, the standard choice of transformation will (of course) be $\psi_{\mathbb{RP}^1} := \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. For a circle of the form $\Gamma = \gamma\mathbb{RP}^1$, where $\gamma = \alpha + \beta\sqrt{-1} \in S^1$ and $\beta > 0$, the standard choice of transformation will be

$$\psi_{\gamma\mathbb{RP}^1} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\gamma \end{pmatrix}.$$

We note that if $\mathbf{a} = -\mathbf{a}$ is a multiset of points on Γ, then $\psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a}) = -\psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a})$; therefore Convention 2.6 can and will be used in this situation. For a circle of the form $\Gamma = \gamma S^1$, where $\gamma > 0$, the standard choice of transformation will be

$$\psi_{\gamma S^1} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\gamma \\ \sqrt{-1} & \gamma\sqrt{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this case, if $\mathbf{a} = -\mathbf{a}$ is a multiset of points on Γ, then it is not necessarily true that $\psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a}) = -\psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a})$; instead $\psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a})$ will be invariant under the transformation $z \mapsto -z^{-1}$. Convention 2.4 will be therefore be used for these circles.

Finally, we note that even if $\Gamma = \mathbb{RP}^1$, it can be interesting to consider $x_T(\mathbf{a}, \psi)$ where $\psi \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a Möbius transformation other than the identity element. For example, let $\Psi := \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. This transformation has the property that that $\mathbf{a}$ is invariant under $z \mapsto -z$ if and only if $\Psi(\mathbf{a})$ is invariant under $z \mapsto z^{-1}$. The latter is,

uncoincidentally, a composition of the two types of symmetries we have just seen. It turns out also to be related to the combinatorial operation of folding a tableau.

Proposition 2.8. *Let* $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{2M}\} \in \overline{\mathscr{A}}$*, and suppose that* $|a_k| \geq 1$ *for all* $k = 1, \ldots, 2M$*. Then*

$$x_T(\mathbf{a}, \Psi) = x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)}(\mathbf{a}) .$$

In the case where $\mathbf{a}$ is a multiset, the left hand side is defined using Convention 2.4, whereas the right hand side is defined using Convention 2.6.

Proof. This is proved in [18, Proposition 3.11], in the case where $\mathbf{a}$ is a set. The right hand side extends continuously to the case where $\mathbf{a}$ is a multiset using Convention 2.6. The hypothesis $|a_k| \geq 1$ ensures that $\Psi(a_k) \geq 0$. Hence the $\preceq$-zone containing $\Psi(\mathbf{a})$ is the same all $\mathbf{a}$, and so we can also extend the the left hand side continuously. □

3 The embedding of the Lagrangian Grassmannian

In this section we will construct the embedding Ω of the Lagrangian Grassmannian in X and establish several facts about it, culminating in the proof Theorem 1.2. The main idea is to study the intersections of the Schubert varieties $X_\lambda(a)$ with Ω. Some of the results here are basic facts about $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ and its cohomology; for example, the cohomological proof of the identity $|\mathsf{DST}(\square)| = |\mathsf{AST}(\square)|$ is given in Lemma 3.11. Others are specific to the embedding Ω, including an analogue of Theorem 2.2 for $\mathrm{LG}(n)$.

The definition of Ω is simple to state, even if it appears to come out of thin air. Consider the $2n$-dimensional subspace $\mathbb{V} \subset \mathbb{C}_{2n}[z]$, of polynomials whose middle coefficient is 0:

$$\mathbb{V} := \{f(z) \in \mathbb{C}_{2n}[z] \mid [z^n] f(z) = 0\} .$$

Let $\overline{X} := \mathrm{Gr}(n, \mathbb{V}) \subset X$ denote the Grassmannian of n-planes in $\mathbb{V}$. We define a symplectic form $[\cdot, \cdot]$ on $\mathbb{V}$: for

$$f(z) = \sum_{\substack{k=-n \\ k \neq 0}}^{n} a_k \frac{z^{n+k}}{(n+k)!} \qquad \text{and} \qquad g(z) = \sum_{\substack{k=-n \\ k \neq 0}}^{n} b_k \frac{z^{n+k}}{(n+k)!}$$

let

$$[f(z), g(z)] := \sum_{\substack{k=-n \\ k \neq 0}}^{n} \frac{1}{k} a_k b_{-k} .$$

For a subspace $A \subset \mathbb{V}$, let $A^\perp$ denote the perpendicular complement of A under the symplectic form $[\cdot, \cdot]$. Define $\Omega \subset X$ to be the Grassmannian of Lagrangian n-planes in $\mathbb{V}$, with respect to $[\cdot, \cdot]$:

$$\Omega := \{x \in \overline{X} \mid x = x^\perp\} .$$

This is the embedding of LG(n) that appears in the statement of Theorem 1.2.

Given full flags $G_\bullet$ and $H_\bullet$ in $\mathbb{V}$, we write $G_\bullet \perp H_\bullet$, if $G_i = H_{2n-i}^\perp$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, 2n$. $G_\bullet$ is an **orthogonal flag** if $G_\bullet \perp G_\bullet$, and $G_\bullet$ is a **symplectic flag** if $G_{2i} \cap G_{2i}^\perp = \{0\}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. We define, for each $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, a full flag $\overline{F}_\bullet(a)$ in $\mathbb{V}$ by starting with

$$F_0(a) \cap \mathbb{V} \subset F_1(a) \cap \mathbb{V} \subset \cdots \subset F_{2n+1}(a) \cap \mathbb{V}$$

and deleting the repeated subspace. Note that if $a = 0$ or $a = \infty$, then the repeated subspace is $F_n(a) \cap \mathbb{V} = F_{n+1}(a) \cap \mathbb{V}$; otherwise it is $F_0(a) \cap \mathbb{V} = F_1(a) \cap \mathbb{V}$. Nevertheless, this is a continuous family of flags.

Lemma 3.1. *For $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, we have $\overline{F}_\bullet(a) \perp \overline{F}_\bullet(-a)$. In particular $\overline{F}_\bullet(0)$ and $\overline{F}_\bullet(\infty)$ are orthogonal flags, and $\overline{F}_\bullet(a)$ is a symplectic flag for all $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$.*

Proof. If $a = 0$, or $a = \infty$, then $\overline{F}_\bullet(a)$ is a coordinate flag, and result is easily checked. Otherwise, consider the polynomials $f_0(a;z), \ldots, f_{2n-1}(a;z) \in \mathbb{V}$, defined by

$$f_i(a;z) := \frac{(z+a)^i\big((i+1-n)z - na\big)}{(i+1)!} = \sum_{k=-n}^{n} \frac{k\, a^{i+1-n-k}}{(i+1-n-k)!} \cdot \frac{z^{n+k}}{(n+k)!}\,.$$

Here, we adopt the useful convention that $\frac{1}{k!} = 0$ when k is a negative integer. It is not hard to see that $\{f_{2n-i}(a;z), \ldots, f_{2n-1}(a;z)\}$ is a basis for $\overline{F}_i(a)$, if $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Thus, it suffices to show that $[f_i(a;z), f_j(-a;z)] = 0$, whenever $i + j \geq 2n$. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
[f_i(a;z), f_j(-a;z)] &= \sum_{\substack{k=-n \\ k\neq 0}}^{n} \frac{1}{k} \cdot \frac{k\, a^{i+1-n-k}}{(i+1-n-k)!} \cdot \frac{(-k)(-a)^{j+1-n+k}}{(j+1-n+k)!} \\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{a^{i+1-n-k}}{(i+1-n-k)!} \cdot \frac{k(-a)^{j+1-n+k}}{(j+1-n+k)!} \\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Big([z^{i+1-n-k}]e^{az}\Big)\Big([z^{j+1-n+k}]e^{-az}(n-j-1-az)\Big) \\
&= [z^{i+j+2-2n}]e^{az}\cdot e^{-az}(n-j-1-az) = 0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, to see that $\overline{F}_\bullet(a)$ is a symplectic flag, note that if $g(z) \in \overline{F}_{2i}(a) \cap \overline{F}_{2n-2i}(-a)$, then $g(z)$ is a scalar multiple of $p(z/a)^2$, where $p(z) = (z+1)^{n-i}(z-1)^i$. From the fact that $[z^j]p(z) = (-1)^i[z^{n-j}]p(z)$, we deduce that $p(z)^2 \notin \mathbb{V}$, and therefore $g(z) = 0$. $\square$

The **Schubert cells** in $\overline{X}$ relative to the flags $\overline{F}_\bullet(a)$ are denoted

$$\overline{X}^\circ_\lambda(a) := \big\{x \in X \;\big|\; \dim(x \cap \overline{F}_{2n-i}(a)) - \dim(x \cap \overline{F}_{2n-1-i}(a)) = \delta_{i\in J(\lambda)},\ \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq 2n-1\big\}\,,$$

and the **Schubert varieties** $\overline{X}_\lambda(a)$ are their closures. Here λ belongs to the subset $\overline{\Lambda} \subset \Lambda$ of partitions with $\lambda^1 \leq n$. Denote the conjugate partition of λ by $\widetilde{\lambda}$. Let $\lambda_+ \in \Lambda$



Figure 3.1: $\lambda = 6441$ (left) and $\lambda_+ = 7551$ (right).

.

denote the partition defined by

$$\lambda_+^i = \begin{cases} \lambda^i + 1 & \text{if } \lambda^i \geq i \\ \lambda^i & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Diagrammatically, λ_+ is obtained by "doubling the diagonal" of λ, as illustrated in Figure 3.1.

Lemma 3.2. *For a partition $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$ we have:*

(i) If $a = 0$ or $a = \infty$, then $\overline{X}_\lambda(a) = \overline{X} \cap X_{\lambda_+}(a)$.

(ii) If $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, then $\overline{X}_\lambda(a) = \overline{X} \cap X_\lambda(a)$.

Proof. Suppose $x \in \overline{X}^\circ_\lambda(a)$, and $x \in X^\circ_{\lambda'}(a)$. Let $J(\lambda) = \{j_1, \ldots, j_n\}$ and $J(\lambda') = \{j'_1, \ldots, j'_n\}$, with $j_1 < \cdots < j_n$ and $j'_1 < \cdots < j'_n$. If $a = 0$ or $a = \infty$, then $\overline{F}_i(a) = F_i(a) \cap \mathbb{V}$ if $i < n$, and $\overline{F}_i(a) = F_{i+1}(a) \cap \mathbb{V}$ if $i \geq n$. It follows from the definition of the Schubert cells that $j_i = j'_i$ if $j_i < n$ and $j'_i = j_i + 1$ if $j_i \geq n$. Equivalently, $\lambda' = \lambda_+$, which proves (i). If $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, then $\overline{F}_i(a) = F_{i+1}(a) \cap \mathbb{V}$. It follows that $j_i = j'_i$ for all i; hence $\lambda' = \lambda$, which proves (ii). □

Lemma 3.3. *If $x \in \overline{X}_\lambda(a)$, then $x^\perp \in \overline{X}_{\widetilde{\lambda}}(-a)$,*

Proof. It is enough to prove the corresponding statement for Schubert cells. Suppose $x \in \overline{X}^\circ_\lambda(a)$ and $x^\perp \in \overline{X}^\circ_{\lambda'}(-a)$. We must show that $\lambda' = \widetilde{\lambda}$.

For any two subspaces $A, B \subset \mathbb{V}$ we have

$$\dim(A \cap B) = \dim \mathbb{V} - \dim A^\perp - \dim B^\perp + \dim(A^\perp \cap B^\perp).$$

Putting $A = x$, $B = \overline{F}_i(a)$, and hence $B^\perp = \overline{F}_{2n-i}(-a)$ by Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$\dim(x \cap \overline{F}_i(a)) = n - i + \dim(x^\perp \cap \overline{F}_{2n-i}(-a)),$$

and therefore

$$\Big(\dim(x \cap \overline{F}_{i+1}(a)) - \dim(x \cap \overline{F}_i(a))\Big) + \Big(\dim(x^\perp \cap \overline{F}_{2n-i}(-a)) - \dim(x^\perp \cap \overline{F}_{2n-i-1}(-a))\Big) = 1.$$



Figure 3.2: The strict partition 431 (left) and its double 5542 (right).

.

From the definition of $X^\circ_\lambda(a)$, it follows that $i \in J(\lambda)$ if and only if $2n-1-i \notin J(\lambda')$; equivalently, $\lambda' = \widetilde{\lambda}$. □

Let Σ_0 denote the set of all strict partitions $\sigma : \sigma^1 > \sigma^2 > \cdots > \sigma^d > 0$, with $\sigma_1 \leq n$. We generally represent a strict partition pictorially using its shifted diagram, and therefore in the context of strict partitions, we will use the symbol $\ntriangleright$ to denote the partition $n > n-1 > \cdots > 2 > 1$, which is the largest partition in Σ_0. We also define the analogous set for not-necessarily-strict partitions: $\Sigma_1 := \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid \lambda \subseteq \ntriangleright\}$.

For $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$, the **double** of σ is the partition $\lambda \in \Lambda$, defined by

$$\lambda^i = \sigma^i + \#\{j \mid j \leq i < j + \sigma^j\},$$

where by convention, $\sigma^i = 0$ if i is greater than the number of parts of σ. The diagram of λ is composed of two copies of the shifted diagram of σ, one of which is reflected along a diagonal. This is illustrated in Figure 3.2.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose $x \in \Omega$. For each $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, let λ_a denote the unique partition such that $x \in X^\circ_{\lambda_a}(a)$. Then*

(i) λ_0 and λ_∞ are doubles of strict partitions;

(ii) λ_{-a} is the conjugate of λ_a for all $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$.

Proof. If $x \in \Omega$, then $x = x^\perp$. Let κ_a be the unique partition such $x \in \overline{X}^\circ_{\kappa_a}$. By Lemma 3.3, we see that $\kappa_{-a} = \widetilde{\kappa_a}$. In particular $\mu = \kappa_0$ and $\nu = \kappa_\infty$ are self-conjugate, and by Lemma 3.2(i), $\lambda_0 = \mu_+$ and $\lambda_\infty = \nu_+$. This is equivalent to (i). Statement (ii) follows from Lemma 3.2(ii), since $\kappa_a = \lambda_a$, and $\kappa_{-a} = \lambda_{-a}$ for $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. □

For $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$, and $a = 0$ or $a = \infty$, let $\Omega_\sigma(a) := \Omega \cap X_\lambda(a)$ where λ is the double of σ. These are **Schubert varieties** in Ω, defined relative to the orthogonal flags $\overline{F}_\bullet(0)$ and $\overline{F}_\bullet(\infty)$. Let $[\Omega_\sigma] \in H^*(\Omega)$ denote cohomology class of $\Omega_\sigma(0)$ (or equivalently the class of $\Omega_\sigma(\infty)$).

For $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, we define $\Omega_\lambda(a) := \Omega \cap X_\lambda(a)$. These are not Schubert varieties in Ω, but rather, restrictions of Schubert varieties defined relative to symplectic flags in $\mathbb{V}$. The next lemma shows that Σ_1 is the natural indexing set for the schemes $\Omega_\lambda(a)$.

Lemma 3.5. *For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, $\Omega_\lambda(a)$ is non-empty if and only if $\lambda \in \Sigma_1$. If $\lambda = \boxslash$ then $\Omega_\lambda(a)$ is a single point.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, we have $\Omega_\lambda(a) \subset X_\lambda(a) \cap X_{\widetilde{\lambda}}(-a)$. If $\lambda \notin \Sigma_1$, $X_\lambda(a) \cap X_{\widetilde{\lambda}}(-a) = \emptyset$, and therefore $\Omega_\lambda(a) = \emptyset$. If $\lambda \in \Sigma_1$ then consider the vector space $x \in X$ spanned by the polynomials $g_1(z/a), \ldots, g_n(z/a)$, where

$$g_i(z) := (z+1)^{2i-1}(z-1)^{2n-2i+1}.$$

It is easy to check directly that $x \in X_\lambda(a)$. Since $[z^j]g_i(z) = -[z^{2n-j}]g_i(z)$, we see that $g_i(z) \in \mathbb{V}$, and therefore $g_i(z/a) \in \overline{F}_{2n-2i+1}(a) \cap \overline{F}_{2i+1}(-a)$. From Lemma 3.1, it follows that $[g_i(z/a), g_j(z/a)] = 0$ for all i, j; hence $x \in \Omega$. Thus $\Omega_\lambda(a)$ is non-empty, as it contains the point x. Finally, if $\lambda = \boxslash$, then $\widetilde{\lambda} = \lambda^\vee$. This implies that $X_\lambda(a) \cap X_{\widetilde{\lambda}}(-a)$ is a single point, and therefore so is $\Omega_\lambda(a)$. □

Let $\iota : \Omega \hookrightarrow X$ denote the inclusion map, which induces a map $\iota^* : H^*(X) \to H^*(\Omega)$ on cohomology.

Lemma 3.6. *For $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, the intersection $\Omega \cap X_\lambda(a)$ is transverse at every smooth point of $X_\lambda(a)$. Hence the cohomology class defined by $\Omega_\lambda(a)$ is $\iota^*[X_\lambda] \in H^*(\Omega)$.*

Proof. By Kleiman's Theorem [10], Ω will intersect a Schubert variety in $\overline{X}$ defined relative to a generic flag transversely. The symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathbb{V})$ acts transitively on the open set of symplectic flags, and fixes Ω. Therefore symplectic flags are generic, and the result follows. □

We will need two additional classical results about the class $[\Omega_\square] \in H^*(\Omega)$. First:

Proposition 3.7. $[\Omega_\square] = \iota^*[X_\square]$.

Second, we recall the Chevalley formula [1] for multiplication by $[\Omega_\square]$ in $H^*(\Omega)$.

Proposition 3.8. *In $H^*(\Omega)$,*

$$[\Omega_\sigma] \cdot [\Omega_\square] = \sum_{|\tau/\sigma|=1} 2^{1+\mathrm{parts}(\sigma)-\mathrm{parts}(\tau)} [\Omega_\tau]$$

where the sum is taken over all $\tau \in \Sigma_0$ obtainable by adding a box to σ, and parts(σ) *is the number of non-zero parts of σ.*

In the interest of consolidating our notation, put $\Sigma_\infty := \Sigma_0$, and $\Sigma_a := \Sigma_1$ for all $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. This allows us to consider, for any $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, the varieties $\Omega_\kappa(a)$ for $\kappa \in \Sigma_a$. The next theorem is an analogue of Theorem 2.2 for the Lagrangian Grassmannian.

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose $a_1, \ldots, a_K \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ are points such that $a_i \neq \pm a_j$ for $i \neq j$, and $a_1, -a_1, \ldots, a_K, -a_K$ lie on a circle. Let $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_K$ be partitions, where $\kappa_k \in \Sigma_{a_k}$ for all k, and $|\kappa_1| + \cdots + |\kappa_K| = M$. Then the intersection*

$$\Omega_{\kappa_1}(a_1) \cap \cdots \cap \Omega_{\kappa_K}(a_K) \tag{3.1}$$

is finite and transverse in Ω. Hence, the number of points in this intersection is $\int_\Omega \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_K$, where $\alpha_k = \iota^*[X_{\kappa_k}]$ if $a_k \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, and $\alpha_k = [\Omega_{\kappa_j}]$ otherwise.

Proof. If $a_k \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, then by Lemma 3.4, $\Omega_{\kappa_k}(a_k)$ is a subscheme of $Z_k := X_{\kappa_k}(a_k) \cap X_{\widetilde{\kappa}_k}(-a_k)$. Otherwise, $\Omega_{\kappa_k}(a_k)$ is a Schubert variety in Ω, which is a subscheme of $Z_k := X_{\lambda_k}(a_k)$ where λ_k is the double of κ_k. Note that $Z_1 \cap \cdots \cap Z_K$ is an intersection of the form (2.1), where the sum of the sizes of the partitions involved is equal to $2|\kappa_1| + \cdots + 2|\kappa_K| = 2M$; hence it is finite and reduced scheme by Theorem 2.2. Since the intersection (3.1) is a subscheme of $Z_1 \cap \cdots \cap Z_K$, it must also be a finite and reduced scheme, and hence a transverse intersection. □

Remark 3.10. Sottile has also conjectured an analogue of Theorem 2.2 for $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ [22]. However, this conjecture involves a one-parameter family of orthogonal flags and is not equivalent to Theorem 3.9. It is unclear if there is any relationship between the two statements. We discuss this conjecture further in Section 5.

For our immediate purposes, we will need the case where $K = M$, and $\kappa_k = \ydiagram{1}$ for all k. Here it follows that $\Omega_{\ydiagram{1}}(a_1) \cap \cdots \cap \Omega_{\ydiagram{1}}(a_M)$ is a transverse intersection in Ω, and the number of points in this intersection is $\int_\Omega [\Omega_{\ydiagram{1}}]^M$.

Lemma 3.11. $|\mathsf{DST}(\ydiagram{2})| = \int_\Omega [\Omega_{\ydiagram{1}}]^M = |\mathsf{AST}(\ydiagram{2})|$.

Proof. The first equality follows from Proposition 3.8. For the second, note that Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6 imply that $\iota^*[X_\lambda]$ is the class of a point if $\lambda = \ydiagram{2,1}$, and $\iota^*[X_\lambda] = 0$ if $\lambda \vdash M$ and $\lambda \neq \ydiagram{2,1}$. Thus we have

$$[\Omega_{\ydiagram{1}}]^M = \iota^*([X_{\ydiagram{1}}]^M) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash M} |\mathsf{SYT}(\lambda)| \cdot \iota^*[X_\lambda] = |\mathsf{SYT}(\ydiagram{2,1})| \cdot [\text{point}],$$

and so $\int_\Omega [\Omega_{\ydiagram{1}}]^M = |\mathsf{SYT}(\ydiagram{2,1})| = |\mathsf{AST}(\ydiagram{2})|$. □

We conclude this section with a proof of our main theorem, which we now restate using the notation of Section 2. For a multiset $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{2M}\}$, we will say that $\mathbf{a}$ is **even**, if $\mathbf{a} = -\mathbf{a}$, and the points $0, \infty \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ have even multiplicity in $\mathbf{a}$. (Equivalently $\mathbf{a}$ is even if $\prod_{a_k \neq \infty}(z + a_k)$ is an even polynomial.)

Theorem 1.2. *Let $x \in X(\mathbf{a})$.*

(i) If $x \in \Omega$ then $\mathbf{a}$ is even.

Conversely, suppose $\mathbf{a}$ *is even, and assume the points of* $\mathbf{a}$ *lie on a circle* Γ *in* $\mathbb{CP}^1$.

(ii) If Γ *passes through* 0 *and* ∞ *then* $x \in \Omega$ *if and only if* $x = x_T(\mathbf{a}, \psi_\Gamma)$ *for some* $T \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$*, using Convention 2.6.*

(iii) If Γ *does not pass through* 0 *and* ∞*, then* $x \in \Omega$ *if and only if* $x = x_T(\mathbf{a}, \psi_\Gamma)$ *for some* $T \in \mathsf{AST}(\square)$*, using Convention 2.4.*

Proof. Suppose $x \in \Omega$, and define λ_a as in Lemma 3.4. By Lemma 2.1, $(z+a)^{|\lambda_a|}$ and $(z-a)^{|\lambda_{-a}|}$ are the largest powers of $(z+a)$ and $(z-a)$ that divide $\mathrm{Wr}(x;z)$. If $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, then Lemma 3.4(ii) implies that $|\lambda_a| = |\lambda_{-a}|$, so a and $-a$ have the same multiplicity in $\mathbf{a}$. If $a = 0$, then Lemma 3.4(i) implies that λ_0 is the double of a strict partition, so $|\lambda_0|$ is even; hence 0 has even multiplicity in $\mathbf{a}$. A similar argument holds for ∞. This proves part (i).

For part (ii), we will assume $\Gamma = \mathbb{RP}^1$, since the other cases follow by applying the argument below to $\psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a})$ and $\psi_\Gamma(x)$. We first prove this in the case where $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, -a_1, \ldots, a_M, -a_M\}$, with $0 \prec a_1 \prec \cdots \prec a_M$. Suppose that $x \in \Omega$ Since the correspondence is bijective on the fibre $X(\mathbf{a})$ so there exists a unique tableau T such that $x = x_T(\mathbf{a})$. Consider the path

$$\mathbf{a}_{k,t} := \{ta_1, -ta_1, \ldots, ta_k, -ta_k, a_{k+1}, -a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_{2M}, -a_{2M}\},$$

for $t \in [0,1]$. We can lift this to a path $x_{k,t} \in X(\mathbf{a}_{k,t})$ where $x_{k,1} = x$. Since $x \in \Omega$, and $\mathbf{a}_{k,t}$ is even for all t, we will have $x_{k,t} \in \Omega$ for all k and t. Now, since the correspondence $T \mapsto x_T$ is continuous under Convention 2.6, $x_{k,t} = x_T(\mathbf{a}_{k,t})$ for all k and t. In particular $x_{k,0} = x_T(\mathbf{a}_{k,0})$. Let λ_0 be the partition such that $x_{k,0} \in X^\circ_{\lambda_0}(x)$. By Lemma 3.4(i), λ_0 is the double of strict partition. But by Theorem 2.5(i), λ_0 is the shape of $T_{[1,2k]}$. In other words the shape of $T_{[1,2k]}$ is the double of a strict partition for all k; equivalently $T \in DST(\square)$. Conversely, note that if $x \in \Omega$ then $x \in \Omega_{\square}(a_1) \cap \cdots \cap \Omega_{\square}(a_M)$. By Lemma 3.11, there are exactly $|\mathsf{DST}(\square)|$ points with this property, and since the correspondence is bijective on the fibre $X(\mathbf{a})$ we see that if $x \notin \Omega$, then $T \notin \mathsf{DST}(\square)$.

For the general case of (ii), where $\mathbf{a}$ is a multiset or $0 \in \mathbf{a}$, consider a path $\mathbf{a}_t \in \overline{\mathscr{A}}$, $t \in [0,1]$, where $\mathbf{a}_0 = \mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{a}_1$ is a set. For any lifting $x_t \in X(\mathbf{a}_t)$ such that $x_0 = x$, we can associate a tableau $T \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$: the unique tableau for which $x_1 = x_T(\mathbf{a}_1)$. By continuity of the correspondence, $x = x_T(\mathbf{a})$. Finally note that $x \in \Omega$, if and only if there exists a lifting x_t where $x_t \in \Omega$ for all t, which, as we have just shown, holds if and only if $T \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$. This completes the proof (ii).

The argument for part (iii) is similar, except that the involvement of ψ_Γ cannot be skirted so easily. Suppose $\Gamma = \gamma S^1$, where $\gamma > 0$. We first prove this in the case where $\mathbf{a}$ is a set. Let $\mathbf{b} := \psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a})$. Since $\mathbf{a}$ is even, $\mathbf{b} = \{b_1, -b_1^{-1}, \ldots, b_M, -b_M^{-1}\}$. We may assume

$$b_1 \prec \cdots \prec b_M \prec -b_M^{-1} \prec \cdots \prec -b_1^{-1}.$$

Suppose that $x \in \Omega$ Since the correspondence is bijective on the fibre $X(\mathbf{a})$ so there exists a unique tableau T such that $x = x_T(\mathbf{a}, \psi_\Gamma)$; i.e. $\psi_\Gamma(x) = x_T(\mathbf{b})$. Consider the

path

$$\mathbf{b}_{k,t} := \{t b_1, -t^{-1} b_1^{-1}, \ldots, t b_k, -t^{-1} b_k^{-1}, b_{k+1}, -b_{k+1}^{-1}, \ldots, b_{2M}, -b_{2M}^{-1}\},$$

for $t \in [0,1]$. Let $\mathbf{a}_{k,t} := \psi_\Gamma^{-1}(\mathbf{b}_{k,t})$. We can lift this to a path $x_{k,t} \in X(\mathbf{b}_{k,t})$ where $x_{k,1} = x$. Since $x \in \Omega$, and $\mathbf{a}_{k,t}$ is even for all t, we will have $x_{k,t} \in \Omega$ for all k and t. Now, since $\mathbf{b}_{k,t}$ is in the same $\preceq$-zone for all t, $x_{k,t} = x_T(\mathbf{a}_{k,t}, \psi_\Gamma)$ for all k and t. In particular $x_{k,0} = x_T(\mathbf{a}_{k,0}, \psi_\Gamma)$, i.e. $\psi_\Gamma(x_{k,0}) = x_T(\mathbf{b}_{k,0})$. For $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ let λ_a be the partition such that $x_{k,0} \in X^\circ_{\lambda_a}(x)$. By Lemma 3.4(ii), λ_γ is the conjugate of $\lambda_{-\gamma}$. But since $\psi_\Gamma(\gamma) = 0$, and $\psi_\Gamma(-\gamma) = \infty$,

$$\psi_\Gamma(x_{k,0}) \in X_{\lambda_\gamma}(0) \cap X_{\lambda_{-\gamma}}(\infty)$$

so by Theorem 2.5(i), λ_γ is the shape of $T_{[1,k]}$, and $\lambda_{-\gamma}$ is the rectification shape of $T_{[2M-k+1,2M]}$, which is the shape rotated by 180°. In other words for all k, the shape of $T_{[2M-k+1,2M]}$ is the conjugate of the shape of $T_{[1,k]}$, rotated by 180°; equivalently $T \in \mathsf{AST}(\square)$. By Lemma 3.11, there are exactly $|\mathsf{AST}(\square)|$ points in $X(\mathbf{a}) \cap \Omega$ and so if $x \notin \Omega$, then $T \notin \mathsf{AST}(\square)$.

The proof of the general case of (ii) is also similar to the general case of (ii), except that here we are using Convention 2.4. Therefore, to same make the argument work, we need $\mathbf{a}_t$ to be even for all t, and $\psi_\Gamma(\mathbf{a}_t)$ must remain within a single $\preceq$-zone for all t. It is not too hard to see that it is always possible to choose such a path: if we write $\mathbf{a}_t = \{a_{1,t}, \ldots, a_{2M,t}\}$, the condition $0 < \psi_\Gamma(a_{k,0}) - \psi_\Gamma(a_{k,t}) < \varepsilon$ is good enough to ensure the latter condition, provided ε is sufficiently small. From here, the argument is the same as in the proof of (ii). □

4 Interpolation between two circles

In this section we relate parts (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 1.2, by interpolating between the two types of circles. The arguments in [18, Section 3] accomplish similar things by using the group $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ of Möbius transformations to relate the correspondence for different circles; unfortunately, the subgroup $\mathrm{O}_2(\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ preserving Ω is too small to use the same arguments here: $\mathrm{O}_2(\mathbb{C})$ has $\{0, \infty\} \subset \mathbb{CP}^1$ as an orbit and therefore does not contain a transformation that takes S^1 to $\mathbb{RP}^1$. Thus, in order to accomplish the task, we need to extend Theorem 2.2 beyond the realm of points on a circle. To do this, we will introduce a parameter u, which we will sometimes treat as an element of $\mathbb{C}^\times$, and sometimes as a formal parameter. In the latter case, we will be working over the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{C}(u)$, which we denote as $\mathbb{K}$. Since there are will be very few technical issues to consider, we will continue to use the notation X, $X(\mathbf{a})$, Ω, etc. when working over $\mathbb{K}$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $u \mapsto \phi_u$ be an algebraic group homomorphism $\mathbb{C}^\times \to \mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$, and let K' be an integer. For $a_1, \ldots, a_K$ and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_K$ as in Theorem 2.2, put*

$$a_k^* := \begin{cases} \phi_u(a_k) & \text{if } 1 \le k \le K' \\ \phi_{u^{-1}}(a_k) & \text{if } K'+1 \le k \le K\,. \end{cases}$$

If we regard u as a formal parameter so that $a_1^*, \ldots, a_K^* \in \mathbb{KP}^1$, then the intersection

$$X_{\lambda_1}(a_1^*) \cap \cdots \cap X_{\lambda_K}(a_K^*)$$

is finite and transverse.

Proof. If we set $u = 1$, then $a_k^* = a_k$, so the result is true by Theorem 2.2. Since the condition of being a finite transverse intersection is open, the result remains true if u is a formal parameter. □

Now assume that the two fixed points of ϕ_u lie on the same circle Γ as $a_1, \ldots, a_K$. In this case, note that $\phi_{-1}(\Gamma) = \Gamma$, and $\Gamma' := \phi_{\sqrt{-1}}(\Gamma) = \phi_{-\sqrt{-1}}(\Gamma)$ is also a circle. Hence, if we put $a_k' := a_k^*\big|_{u=\sqrt{-1}}$, then the points $a_1', \ldots, a_K'$ lie on the circle Γ'. For values of $u \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ other than $\{\pm 1, \pm\sqrt{-1}\}$, the points $a_1^*, \ldots, a_K^*$ lie on a union of two circles.

Effectively, Proposition 4.1 allows us to extend the correspondence $T \mapsto x_T$ to a situation — albeit a more limited one — in which the roots of the Wronskian lie on a union of two circles, which will allow us to interpolate between S^1 and $\mathbb{RP}^1$. First, consider the case where $K = 2M$, $K' = M$, and $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{2M}\} \subset \mathbb{RP}^1$, where

$$a_1 \prec a_2 \prec \cdots \prec a_{2M}\,.$$

Put $\phi_u := \left(\begin{smallmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, which fixes 0 and ∞. Let $\mathbf{a}^* = \{a_1^*, \ldots, a_{2M}^*\}$, and $\mathbf{a}' = \{a_1', \ldots, a_{2M}'\} \subset \sqrt{-1} \cdot \mathbb{RP}^1$. Then one can define the correspondence $\mathsf{SYT}(\square) \to X(\mathbf{a}^*)$, $T \mapsto x_T(\mathbf{a}^*)$, using Definition 2.3, and extend it, using whichever convention is appropriate, to the case where

$$a_1 \preceq \cdots \preceq a_M \prec a_{M+1} \preceq \cdots \preceq a_{2M}\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, since the definition of $x_T(\mathbf{a}^*)$ is the literally the same as in Section 2, it is compatible with the definition of $x_T(\mathbf{a})$, and provided

$$a_k \neq -a_{k+1} \quad \text{or} \quad a_k \in \{0, \infty\} \qquad \text{for all } k = 1, \ldots, 2M-1 \tag{4.2}$$

then it is also compatible with the definition of $x_T(\mathbf{a}')$. Here, "compatible" means:

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{2M}\}$ is a multiset of points on $\mathbb{RP}^1$ satisfying* (4.1) *and* (4.2). *Let $x^* = x_T(\mathbf{a}^*)$, $x = x^*\big|_{u=1}$, and $x' = x^*\big|_{u=\sqrt{-1}}$. Then $x = x_T(\mathbf{a})$, and $x' = x_T(\mathbf{a}')$.*

Proof. Since $0, \infty$ are fixed by ϕ_u, we have $\phi_u(X_\lambda(0)) = X_\lambda(0)$ and $\phi_u(X_\lambda(\infty)) = X_\lambda(\infty)$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Moreover (4.2) ensures that

$$\psi_{\sqrt{-1}\cdot\mathbb{RP}^1}(a'_1) \preceq \cdots \preceq \psi_{\sqrt{-1}\cdot\mathbb{RP}^1}(a'_M) \prec \psi_{\sqrt{-1}\cdot\mathbb{RP}^1}(a'_{M+1}) \preceq \cdots \preceq \psi_{\sqrt{-1}\cdot\mathbb{RP}^1}(a'_{2M}).$$

The proposition now follows from the definition of x_T. □

In general, if the the points of $\mathbf{a}$ lie on an arbitrary circle Γ, one can define $x_T(\mathbf{a}^*) \in X(\mathbf{a}^*)$ via a choice of Möbius transformation ψ_Γ that maps Γ to $\mathbb{RP}^1$. If the fixed points of ϕ_u are w and w', then we will require $\psi_\Gamma(w) = 0$, and $\psi_\Gamma(w') = \infty$. We will use the notation $x_T(\mathbf{a}^*, \psi_\Gamma)$, when it is important to emphasize the transformation being used.

For our purposes, we want $\Gamma = S^1$ to be the unit circle, and $\Gamma' = \mathbb{RP}^1$. To achieve this, let

$$\phi_u := \begin{pmatrix} u+1 & u-1 \\ u-1 & u+1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.3}$$

Then the fixed points of ϕ_u are $\{\pm 1\}$, and $\phi_{\sqrt{-1}}(S_1) = \mathbb{RP}^1$. Note also that if $a \in S^1$, then $\phi_u(a) = -\phi_{u^{-1}}(-a)$, so $\mathbf{a} = -\mathbf{a} \iff \mathbf{a}^* = -\mathbf{a}^* \iff \mathbf{a}' = -\mathbf{a}'$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_M, -a_1, \ldots, -a_M\}$ be a multiset of points on S^1. Let $\mathbf{a}' = \{a'_1, \ldots, a'_M, -a'_1, \ldots, -a'_M\}$ be the multiset of points on $\mathbb{RP}^1$ obtained from $\mathbf{a}$ using the homomorphism* (4.3)*. Assume that $a_1, \ldots, a_M$ have positive real part and non-negative imaginary part; equivalently $1 \le a'_1, \ldots, a'_M < \infty$.*

Let $T \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$ be a tableau, and consider the points $x_T = x_T(\mathbf{a}) \in X(\mathbf{a})$, and $x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)} = x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)}(\mathbf{a}') \in X(\mathbf{a}')$, using the standard conventions for the circles S^1 and $\mathbb{RP}^1$. Then we have:

(i) $x_T \in \Omega$ if and only if $x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)} \in \Omega$;

(ii) for $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $x_T \in X_\lambda(a_k)$ if and only if $x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)} \in X_\lambda(a'_k)$;

(iii) for $\lambda \in \Sigma_1$, $x_T \in \Omega_\lambda(a_k)$ if and only if $x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)} \in \Omega_\lambda(a'_k)$;

(iv) for every $T' \in \mathsf{SYT}(\square)$, $x_T = x_{T'}$ if and only if $x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)} = x_{\mathsf{fold}(T')}$.

Proof. Let $x^* = x_T(\mathbf{a}^*, \psi_{S^1})$, $x = x^*\big|_{u=1}$, and $x' = x^*\big|_{u=\sqrt{-1}}$. Then $\psi_{S^1}(x) \in \mathbb{RP}^1$ and $\psi_{S^1}(x') \in \sqrt{-1}\cdot\mathbb{RP}^1$. Thus by Proposition 4.2,

$$x = x_T(\mathbf{a}, \psi_{S_1}) = x_T \quad \text{and} \quad x' = x_T(\mathbf{a}', \psi_{\sqrt{-1}\cdot\mathbb{RP}^1} \circ \psi_{S^1})$$

Since $\psi_{\sqrt{-1}\cdot\mathbb{RP}^1} \circ \psi_{S^1} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \Psi$, Proposition 2.8 yields

$$x' = x_T(\mathbf{a}', \Psi) = x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)}.$$

Thus properties of $(x, \mathbf{a}, T)$ translate into properties of $(x', \mathbf{a}', \mathsf{fold}(T))$.

Statement (iv) follows immediately. For (i), note that the maps $X(\mathbf{a}^*) \cap \Omega \to X(\mathbf{a}) \cap \Omega$ and $X(\mathbf{a}^*) \cap \Omega \to X(\mathbf{a}') \cap \Omega$ are surjective, and by Theorem 3.9 they are also one to one. We deduce that $x \in \Omega$ if and only if $x' \in \Omega$. Statement (ii) is proved similarly, and (iii) follows from (i) and (ii). □



Figure 4.1: An example of $T \mapsto \mathsf{rect}^\circ(T)$.

Putting this together with Theorem 1.2, we deduce:

Theorem 4.4. $T \in \mathsf{AST}(\square)$ *if and only if* $\mathsf{fold}(T) \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{a}$, x_T and $x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)}$ be as in the statement of Proposition 4.3, where $\mathbf{a}$ is a set. By Theorem 1.2(iii), $T \in \mathsf{AST}(\square)$ if and only if $x_T \in \Omega$. By Theorem 1.2(ii), $\mathsf{fold}(T) \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$ if and only if $x_{\mathsf{fold}(T)} \in \Omega$. The result then follows by Proposition 4.3(i). □

Suppose $\mu, \lambda \in \Lambda$ are doubles of strict partitions, and $\mu \subset \lambda$. We define $\mathsf{DST}(\lambda/\mu)$ analogously to $\mathsf{DST}(\square)$, as the set of standard Young tableaux of skew shape λ/μ with entries

$$1' < 1 < 2' < 2 < \cdots < \ell' < \ell\,,$$

$2\ell = |\lambda/\mu|$, that have diagonal symmetry. For $T \in \mathsf{DST}(\lambda/\mu)$ (or more generally for any tableau with entries ordered as above) define $\mathsf{rect}^\circ(T)$ to be the tableau obtained by the following procedure: For each k from ℓ to 1, delete entry k' and slide the emptied box through the subtableau formed by entries $\{k, k+1, \ldots, \ell\}$; then rectify the resulting tableau. Hence $\mathsf{rect}^\circ(T)$ will be a standard Young tableau with entries $1 < 2 < \cdots < \ell$, of some shape $\nu \in \Sigma_1$. An example is given in Figure 4.1.

Theorem 4.5 (Branching rule)**.** *For $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_0$, and $\nu \in \Sigma_1$, let $g^\sigma_{\nu\tau}$ denote the structure constants of the map $H^*(X) \otimes H^*(\Omega) \to H^*(\Omega)$, in the Schubert basis; i.e.*

$$\iota^*[X_\nu] \cdot [\Omega_\tau] = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} g^\sigma_{\nu\tau} [\Omega_\sigma]\,.$$

Then for any tableau $S \in \mathsf{SYT}(\nu)$, $g^\sigma_{\nu\tau}$ is the number of tableaux T such that $T \in \mathsf{DST}(\lambda/\mu)$, where λ, μ are the doubles of σ, τ respectively, and $\mathsf{rect}^\circ(T) = S$.

Proof. Let $\sigma^\vee \in \Sigma_0$ denote the strict partition whose double is $\lambda^\vee$. Let $e > 1$ be a real number. By Poincaré duality, $g^\sigma_{\nu\tau}$, is the number of point in the triple intersection

$$\Omega_\tau(0) \cap \Omega_\nu(e) \cap \Omega_{\sigma^\vee}(\infty) \tag{4.4}$$

(which is transverse in Ω by Theorem 3.9). We can obtain $g^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau}$ by counting equivalence classes of tableaux $R \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$ such that $x_R = x_R(\mathbf{a}')$ belongs to the intersection (4.4), where $\mathbf{a}' = \{0^{|\mu|}, e^{|\nu|}, (-e)^{|\nu|}, \infty^{|\sigma^\vee|}\}$.

Given $R \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$, let $T := R_{[|\mu|+1,|\lambda|]}$. By Theorem 2.5(i) we have:

(a) $x_R \in \Omega_\tau(0)$ if and only $R_{[1,|\mu|]}$ has shape μ;

(b) $x_R \in \Omega_{\sigma^\vee}(\infty)$ if and only if $R_{[|\lambda|+1,2M]}$ has shape $\square/\lambda$;

(c) $x_R \in \Omega_\nu(1)$ if and only if $\mathrm{rect}^\circ(T)$ has shape ν.

Here we have used Proposition 2.7 to switch from Convention 2.6 to Convention 2.4: in this case, $R_{[1,|\nu|]}$ and $R^\circ_{[1,|\nu|]}$ have the same shape; $R_{[|\lambda|+1,2M]}$ and $R^\circ_{[|\lambda|+1,2M]}$ have the same shape; and $\mathrm{rect}^\circ(T)$ is the rectification of $R^\circ_{[|\mu|,|\mu|+|\nu|]}$.

Now assume (a), (b) and (c) hold. Given another tableau $R' \in \mathsf{DST}(\square)$, we need to determine when $x_R = x_{R'}$. Fix any two tableaux $R_0 \in \mathsf{DST}(\mu)$ and $R_\infty \in \mathsf{DST}(\square/\lambda)$, and let

$$\mathscr{R} := \{R \in \mathsf{DST}(\square) \mid R_{[1,|\mu|]} = R_0 \text{ and } R_{[|\lambda|+1,2M]} = R_\infty\}.$$

By Theorem 2.5(ii), $x_R = x_{R'}$ if $R_{[|\mu|+1,|\lambda|]} = R'_{[|\mu|+1,|\lambda|]}$. In particular if R' is obtained from R by replacing $R_{[0,|\mu]}$ by R_0 and $R_{[|\lambda|+1,2M]}$ by ∞, then $R' \in \mathscr{R}$ and $x_R = x_{R'}$. This shows that $\{x_R \mid R \in \mathscr{R}\}$ contains all points of the intersection (4.4). Therefore to count these points it is enough to determine when $x_R = x_{R'}$ for $R, R' \in \mathscr{R}$.

By Theorem 4.4, we can write $R = \mathsf{fold}(U)$ and $R' = \mathsf{fold}(U')$, where $U, U' \in \mathsf{AST}(\square)$. Note that $\mathrm{rect}^\circ(T)$ is also the rectification of $U_{[|\tau|+1,|\sigma|]}$. We now need Proposition 4.3, which has hypotheses that are not met by $\mathbf{a}'$. Instead, consider a multiset

$$\mathbf{b}' := \{b_1, -b_1, \ldots, b_{|\tau|}, -b_{|\tau|}, e^{|\nu|}, (-e)^{|\nu|}, c_1, -c_1, \ldots, c_{|\sigma^\vee|}, -c_{|\sigma^\vee|}\}$$

where $1 < b_1 < \cdots < b_{|\tau|} < e < c_1 < \cdots < c_{|\sigma^\vee|} < \infty$. For $\mathbf{b}'$ there is a corresponding multiset $\mathbf{b}$ of points on S^1. By Theorem 2.5(ii), $x_R(\mathbf{a}') = x_{R'}(\mathbf{a}')$ if and only if $x_R(\mathbf{b}') = x_{R'}(\mathbf{b}')$, when $R, R' \in \mathscr{R}$. By Proposition 4.3(iv) this occurs if and only if $x_U(\mathbf{b}) = x_{U'}(\mathbf{b})$. Again, by Theorem 2.5(ii), this occurs if and only if $U_{[|\tau|+1,|\sigma|]}$ is dual equivalent to $U'_{[|\tau|+1,|\sigma|]}$, and $U_{[2M-|\sigma|+1,2M-|\tau|]}$ is dual equivalent to $U'_{[2M-|\sigma|+1,2M-|\tau|]}$. But since U is antidiagonally symmetrical, the first two are dual equivalent if and only if the second two are dual equivalent. Thus we have shown that for $R, R' \in \mathscr{R}$, $x_R = x_{R'}$ if and only if $U_{[|\tau|+1,|\sigma|]}$ is dual equivalent to $U'_{[|\tau|+1,|\sigma|]}$.

Since each dual equivalence class contains exactly one tableau that rectifies to S, $g^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau}$ is the number of tableaux $R \in \mathscr{R}$ such that $U_{[|\tau|+1,|\sigma|]}$ rectifies to S, where $R = \mathsf{fold}(U)$. The result follows, since we can identify T with $R \in \mathscr{R}$, and $\mathrm{rect}^\circ(T)$ is the rectification of $U_{[|\tau|+1,|\sigma|]}$. □

Remark 4.6. The constants $g^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau}$ appear in symmetric function theory as the coefficients of the expansion of a skew Schur P-function in terms of ordinary Schur functions: $P_{\sigma/\tau} = \sum_\nu g^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau} s_\nu$, and in equivalent identities involving the Schur Q- and S-functions. In the case where $\tau = \epsilon$ is the empty partition, there are combinatorial formula for

these constants due to Worley [28] and Sagan [20], which are equivalent to the rule in Theorem 4.5 by [7, Proposition 7.1]. The rule for the case where $\tau \neq \epsilon$, can be obtained by from the case where $\tau = \epsilon$ by combinatorial arguments, but it does not appear to have received the same degree of attention. This may be because one has the alternate formula: $g^{\sigma}_{\nu\tau} = \sum_{\kappa} g^{\kappa}_{\nu\epsilon} f^{\sigma}_{\kappa\tau}$, where $f^{\sigma}_{\kappa\tau}$ are the Schubert structure constants for $H^*(\mathrm{LG}(n))$. The combinatorial relationship between this formula and the rule in Theorem 4.5 is unclear.

Remark 4.7. Although the proof of Theorem 4.5 uses some combinatorial properties of dual equivalence, these facts have geometric interpretations, which are established in [15] (or can be established by similar arguments). For example, the fact that each dual equivalence class contains exactly one tableau with a particular rectification is equivalent to the fact that a Schubert variety and its opposite intersect at exactly one point. The interpretation of dual equivalence itself is Theorem 2.5(ii).

5 Miscellaneous remarks

It is worth recording the defining equations for Ω, since they are remarkably easy to state. We do so here, without proof. If $\big(p_\lambda(x)\big)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ are the Plücker coordinates of a point $x \in X$ in the basis $\{1, x, x^2, \ldots, x^{2M}\}$ for $\mathbb{C}_{2M}[z]$, then the Wronski map can be written as

$$\mathrm{Wr}(x;z) = \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} q_\lambda p_\lambda(x) z^{|\lambda|}$$

where $q_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ are constants (see [15, Section 2.2]). Let $\overline{\Lambda}_+ := \{\lambda_+ \mid \lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}\}$. The equations defining Ω (as a projective scheme) consist of the quadratic Plücker equations in the Plücker variables $(p_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ that define X, together with the linear relations:

$$\begin{aligned} p_\mu &= 0 && \text{for } \mu \notin \overline{\Lambda}_+ \\ \text{and} \qquad q_{\lambda_+} p_{\lambda_+} &= (-1)^{|\lambda_+|} q_{\widetilde{\lambda}_+} p_{\widetilde{\lambda}_+} && \text{for } \lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}\,. \end{aligned}$$

This description remains accurate for any diagonal change of basis of $\mathbb{C}_{2M}[z]$. This shows another facet of the connection between Ω and the Wronski map, and Theorem 1.2(i) is an immediate consequence.

One thing that is missing from our story is the Littlewood-Richardson rule for computing the Schubert structure constants of $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ [14]. Although this is closely related to the Littlewood-Richardson rule for $\mathrm{OG}(n, 2n+1)$, it would be nice to have an independent geometric interpretation. There are several problems with this. First is the fact that we only have two orthogonal flags at our disposal, whereas counting points in a triple intersection of Schubert varieties requires three such flags. Another issue is that method in [15] relies on the fact that we can move a point $\mathbf{a}$ continuously from one $\preceq$-zone to another; the discontinuities in the correspondence can be described in terms of jeu de taquin slides. Unfortunately, if $\mathbf{a} \subset \mathbb{RP}^1$ is even, the correspondence is

continuous according to Convention 2.6, and so the embedding Ω does not come with an analogous jeu de taquin theory. Since Theorem 2.2 is false if the roots do not lie on a circle, it is unclear how one could obtain this. An obvious idea is that Theorem 3.9 may extend to a case where the roots lie on a union of two circles; however, this is also false. The generic statement in Proposition 4.1 is not good enough to make these arguments work. Finally, although there are variations of the jeu de taquin for shifted tableaux, they are defined to work on slightly different classes of objects, and do not behave well on $\mathsf{DST}(\square)$.

An alternate place to look for the Littlewood-Richardson rule is in Sottile's conjecture, an analogue of Theorem 2.2 for $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ involving a one parameter family of orthogonal flags [22]. If this conjecture is true, then it could be used in place of Theorem 3.9, which would give us additional orthogonal flags to work with. Unfortunately, it may not be possible to define a correspondence $T \mapsto x_T$ in this situation: part of the conjecture states that for real parameters, the points of a Schubert intersection are non-real whenever there is more than one point. Hence any one-to-one correspondence would have to break the symmetry of complex conjugation. Nevertheless, it might be possible to deduce the Littlewood-Richardson rule without this. We note there is a $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ action on $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ in this picture, and therefore any embedding of $\mathrm{LG}(n)$ in a Grassmannian that is defined by linear equations in the Plücker variables will probably not yield a proof of Sottile's conjecture.

Another application of the Wronski map is to study of the combinatorial operation of promotion on tableaux. Promotion has received a fair amount of attention recently, because of its relevance in representation theory, and recent discoveries about its combinatorial structure [4, 21, 27]. As noted in [18, Remark 1.12], the embedding of $\mathrm{OG}(n, 2n+1)$ in X leads to description of the orbit structure of promotion on $\mathsf{SYT}(\ydiagram{2,1})$. Similarly, the results of this paper can be combined with the arguments in [18] to describe the orbit structure of promotion on $\mathsf{SYT}(\ydiagram{2,2})$. The idea of doubling a staircase tableau to study promotion was suggested in [19], and our framework provides way to carry this out. Promotion on $\mathsf{SYT}(\ydiagram{2,2})$ corresponds to rotation of S^1, under Theorem 1.2(iii). Here are the results one obtains.

Theorem 5.1. *Let p, r be positive integers such that $pr = M$.*

(i) The number of tableaux in $\mathsf{SYT}(\ydiagram{2,1})$ that are fixed by the p^{th} power of promotion is equal to the number of diagonally symmetrical r-ribbon tableaux of shape $\square$ in which rightmost k' is (strictly) left of the rightmost k, for all $k = 1, \ldots, p$.

(ii) For every tableau in $\mathsf{SYT}(\ydiagram{2,2})$, the order of promotion is even. The number of tableaux in $\mathsf{SYT}(\ydiagram{2,2})$ that are fixed by the $(2p)^{th}$ power of promotion is equal to the number of diagonally symmetrical r-ribbon tableaux of shape $\square$.

For ribbon tableaux, diagonal symmetry means that for $i \geq j$, if the entry in row i and column j is k or k', then the entry in row j and column $i+1$ is either k or k'. The ribbons themselves do not need to need to respect the diagonal. For example, if



Figure 5.1: Diagonally symmetrical 3-ribbon tableaux.

$n = 3$, there are four diagonally symmetrical 3-ribbon tableaux, shown in Figure 5.1. The second and third have the property that the rightmost k' is left of the rightmost k, for $k = 1, 2$. If r is even, there are no diagonally symmetrical r-ribbon tableaux of shape $\square$. If r is odd, there are simple formulae for enumerating them [6]. We have not included a proof of Theorem 5.1, because it would be long and tedious. Instead, we note that all of the relevant theorems and proofs in [18] are adaptable, and virtually no new ideas are needed.

The big question still remains: why does Ω exist? More specifically, why should there be *any* embedding of the Lagrangian Grassmannian for which Theorem 1.2(i) holds? In this paper, we defined a particular embedding and checked that it has the desired properties, but the construction is somewhat mysterious — at least it is to the author. If one takes the point of view that Theorem 1.2 should be true because of its combinatorial implications, then Ω is unique, which makes it possible (with some thought and some experimentation) to arrive at the right definition. For example, one approach is to reverse-engineer the definitions of $\mathbb{V}$ and $[\cdot,\cdot]$ using Lemma 3.5 — this quickly reduces to a system of linear equations that is easily solvable for small n, from which one can guess the general pattern. Another approach is to start with a formula for the Wronski map in terms of the Plücker coordinates of X, and assuming Theorem 1.2 is true, guess the defining equations of Ω. Neither of these approaches is straightforward, and certainly neither one tells us that Ω exists, *a priori*. It would be nice to have a geometric explanation that does not hinge on such a brute force calculation as in the proof of Lemma 3.1.

References

[1] C. Chevalley, *Sur les décompositions cellulaires des espaces G/B*, in Algebraic Groups and their Generalizations: Classical Methods, W. Haboush, ed., vol. 56, Part 1. of Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Amer. Math. Soc. 1994, 1–23.

[2] A. Eremenko and A. Gabrielov, *Degrees of real Wronski maps*, Disc. Comp. Geom., **28** (2002), 331–347.

[3] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, *Divisors on general curves and cuspidal rational curves*, Invent. Math., **74** (1983), 371–418.

[4] B. Fontaine and J. Kamnitzer, *Cyclic sieving, rotation, and geometric representation theory* Selecta Math. (to appear).

[5] J. M. Frame, G. d. B. Robinson and R. M. Thrall, *The hook graphs of the symmetric group*, Canad. J. Math., **6** (1954), 316–325.

[6] S. Fomin and D. Stanton, *Rim hook lattices*, Report No. 23, (1991/92) Inst. Mittag-Leffler.

[7] M. Haiman, *On mixed insertion, symmetry, and shifted Young tableaux*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **50** (1989) 196–225.

[8] M. Haiman, *Dual equivalence with applications, including a conjecture of Proctor*, Discrete Math. **99** (1992), 79–113.

[9] P. N. Hoffman and J. F. Humphreys, *Projective representations of the symmetric groups*, Oxford U. P., 1992.

[10] S. Kleiman, *The transversality of a general translate*, Compositio Math. **28** (1974), 287-297.

[11] M. van Leeuwen, *Some bijective correspondences involving domino tableaux*, Elec. J. Combin. **7** (2000), no. 1, R35 (electronic).

[12] E. Mukhin, V. Tarasov and A. Varchenko, *The B. and M. Shapiro conjecture in real algebraic geometry and the Bethe Ansatz*, Ann. Math. **170** (2009), no. 2, 863–881.

[13] E. Mukhin, V. Tarasov and A. Varchenko, *Schubert calculus and representations of general linear group*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 22 (2009), no. 4, 909–940.

[14] P. Pragacz, *Algebro-geometric applications of Schur S- and Q- polynomials*, in Topics in invariant theory, Seminaire d'Algebre Dubreil-Malliavin 1989–1990 (M.-P. Malliavin ed.), Springer Lecture Notes in Math. 1478, 130–191, Springer, 1991.

[15] K. Purbhoo, *Jeu de taquin and a monodromy problem for Wronksians of polynomials*, Adv. Math. **224** (2010) no. 3, 827–862.

[16] K. Purbhoo, *Reality and transversality for Schubert calculus in* $\mathrm{OG}(n, 2n+1)$, Math. Res. Lett. **17** (2010) no. 6, 1041–1046.

[17] K. Purbhoo, *The Wronski map and shifted tableau theory*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2011) no. 24, 5706–5719.

[18] K. Purbhoo, *Wronskians, cyclic group actions, and ribbon tableaux*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **365** (2013), 1977–2030.

[19] S. Pon and Q. Wang, *Promotion and evacuation on standard Young tableaux of rectangle and staircase shape*, Elec. J. Combin. **18** (2011) no. 1, R18 (electronic).

[20] B. E. Sagan, *Shifted tableau, Schur Q-functions, and a conjecture of Stanley,* J. Comb. Theory, ser. A. **45** (1987), 62–03.

[21] B. Rhoades, *Cyclic sieving, promotion, and representation theory*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **117** (2010) no. 1, 38–76.

[22] F. Sottile, *Some real and unreal enumerative geometry for flag manifolds*, Mich. Math. J., **48** (2000), 573–592.

[23] F. Sottile, *Frontiers of reality in Schubert calculus*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **47** (2010), no. 1, 31–71.

[24] M.-P. Schützenberger, *La correspondance de Robinson*, in Combinatoire et représentation du groupe symétrique, Lecture Notes in Math., **579** (1977), Springer-Verlag, 59–113.

[25] J.R. Stembridge, *Shifted tableaux and the projective representations of the symmetric group*, Adv. Math. **74** (1989), 87–134.

[26] R. M. Thrall, *A combinatorial problem*, Michigan Math. J. **1** (1952), 81–88.

[27] B. Westbury, *Invariant tensors and the cyclic sieving phenomenon*, preprint, `arXiv:0912.1512`.

[28] D. Worley, *A theory of shifted Young tableau*, Ph. D. thesis, M.I.T., 1984, available at `http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/15599`.

Combinatorics and Optimization Department, University of Waterloo, 200 University Ave. W. Waterloo, ON, N2L 3G1, Canada. `kpurbhoo@uwaterloo.ca`.